

## Reviewer Report

**Title:** Tool recommender system in Galaxy using deep learning

**Version:** Revision 1      **Date:** 8/19/2020

**Reviewer name:** Bernie Pope, Ph.D.

### Reviewer Comments to Author:

This paper has been previously reviewed for the Journal and therefore I will not provide an overview in this review.

I am satisfied that all of the major concerns about the previous version of the paper have been addressed by the authors, and I am happy to recommend the paper to be accepted for publication.

I have made some small observations below for consideration in the final revision:

This sentence is imprecise and non-committal for a scientific paper: "This should allow good quality tools to be shown as the top recommendations." Likewise "which should allow it ..." Saying "should" sounds like you are not sure if the statement is true or not, but are merely hypothesising.

"First, using a simple approach to store all the indices of sequences of tools" it is unclear what this means: one has to read the supplementary materials to find out. Is there another way to describe this technique?

The "standard" and "normal" categories for tools don't strike me as the most informative of terms.

The paper is rather long, and I would encourage the authors to seek opportunities to be more concise.

### Level of Interest

Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript: Choose an item.

### Quality of Written English

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript: Choose an item.

### Declaration of Competing Interests

Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

- Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
- Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
- Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

- Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
- Do you have any other financial competing interests?
- Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

Choose an item.

To further support our reviewers, we have joined with Publons, where you can gain additional credit to further highlight your hard work (see: <https://publons.com/journal/530/gigascience>). On publication of this paper, your review will be automatically added to Publons, you can then choose whether or not to claim your Publons credit. I understand this statement.

Yes Choose an item.